

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
2-1-2013	07-CV-23317	(S.D. Fla.)	<p>City Pension Fund for Firefighters and Police Officers in the City of Miami Beach v. Aracruz Celulose, S.A. et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants misrepresented the nature and extent of Aracruz's currency hedging program by not disclosing that Aracruz was investing in hedge funds that were far larger and riskier than necessary, thereby inflating the price of Aracruz American Depositary Receipts ("ADRs") and causing financial injury to members of the Class.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased Aracruz ADRs between 4-7-2008 and 10-2-2008, inclusive, and who were damaged thereby.</p>		<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1-800 231-1815</p> <p>www.aracruzadr litigation.com</p>
2-4-2013	11-CV-697	(E.D. Va.)	<p>Pitt v. K-Mart Corp. et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants K-Mart Corporation, Sears Holdings Corporation and affiliates are in violation of certain policies and practices in connection with their use of background checks in the hiring process that violated the FCRA by (1) failing to provide consumers with the most current version of the FCRA Summary of Rights before taking an adverse action against the consumer that was based in whole or in part on the background check; and (2) failing to provide consumers with the FCRA Summary of Rights and a copy of the applicable background check sufficiently far in advance of taking adverse action against the consumer that was based in whole or in part on the background</p>	5-24-13	<p>For more information write to or visit:</p> <p>Leonard A. Bennett Consumer Litigation Associates, P.C., 763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Ste. 1-A Newport News, Va. 23601</p> <p>http://www.SearsFCRAClass Action.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>check.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons residing in the United States or its territories to whom, according to the records of Defendants or their agents, the notice described in 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b) (3) was sent by Defendants' agent on behalf of Sears Holding Management Corporation or any of its affiliates on or after 10-17-2006 but on or before 9-28-2012.</p>		
2-5-2013	08-CV-6992	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>American Art China Company Inc. v. Foxfire and Packaging, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendant had sent advertisements by fax in violation of the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") and various state laws.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons to whom Foxfire or its agents, including but not limited to Westfax, Inc., and FAXTS, Inc., sent facsimiles advertising Foxfire's products or services during the period 2-15-2008 through 11-6-2008.</p>	5-9-2013	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Brian J. Wanca Anderson + Wanca 3701 Algonquin Road Suite 760 Rolling Meadows, IL 60000</p>
2-6-2013	09-CV-00400	(N.D. Ga.)	<p>In re: ING Groep, N.V. ERISA Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants: (1) breached their duties under ERISA by causing the Plans to purchase and hold shares of ING Stock at a time when, according to the Plaintiffs, the stock was an unsuitable and imprudent investment for the Plans; (2) violated ERISA by providing inaccurate and incomplete information to participants and fiduciaries of the Plans; and</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Francis A. Bottini, Jr. Albert Y. Chang Bottini & Bottini, Inc. 7817 Ivanhoe Avenue Suite 201 LaJolla, CA 92037</p> <p>Or</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>(3) failed to avoid conflicts of interest between their personal and corporate interests and their fiduciary responsibilities to the Plans. Plaintiffs seek to recover losses to the Plans, and, indirectly, to the Plans' participants and beneficiaries, caused by Defendants' alleged misconduct.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were participants in or beneficiaries of the Plans at any time during the Relevant Period, starting on 6-1-2007 through 11-5-2012, and whose accounts included investments in ING Stock during the Relevant Period; and as to each such person, his, her or, its beneficiaries, heirs, agents, executors, administrators, alternate payees (including spouses of deceased persons who were participants of the Plans), and successors-in-interest.</p>		<p>Thomas J. McKenna, Esq. Gainey & McKenna 440 Park Avenue South Fifth Floor New York, NY 10016</p>
2-8-2013	11-CV-07238	(D.N.J.)	<p>Rossi v. the Procter & Gamble Co. Plaintiffs allege that Procter & Gamble Company engaged in misleading and deceptive advertising and marketing of Crest Sensitivity Treatment & Protection toothpaste ("Crest STP").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United States who purchased Crest STP from 2-2011 through [date of first Publication].</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to, or call:</p> <p>James E. Cecchi Lindsey H. Taylor Donald E. Ecklund CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO 5 Becker Farm Road Roseland, N.J. 07068 (973) 994-1700</p>
2-11-2013	08-CV-6910	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation (II) (Direct Purchaser) (Defendants Agrium, Inc. and Agrium, U.S., Inc.) (collectively "Agrium-Direct") Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired and</p>	6-12-2013	<p>For more information call:</p> <p>Claims Administrator</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>agreed, in violation of the antitrust laws of the United States, to restrict the supply and raise or "fix" the prices of potash sold in the United States between 7-1-2003 and the present. The complaint describes how the Defendants and Co-Conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. antitrust laws by establishing a global cartel that set artificially high prices for and restricted the supply of potash.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased Potash in the United States directly from one or more Defendants between 7-1-2003 and 1-30-2013.</p>		<p>1-866 482-4786</p> <p>Or outside of the U.S. 1-781 575-4382</p>
2-11-2013	08-CV-6910	(N.D. Ill.)	In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation (II) Direct Purchaser (Defendants Saskatchewan Inc. and PSC Sales (USA), Inc) (see Direct Purchaser above)	6-12-2013	<p>For more information call:</p> <p>Claims Administrator 1-866 482-4786</p> <p>Or outside of the U.S. 1-781 575-4382</p>
2-11-2013	08-CV-6910	(N.D. Ill.)	In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation (II), Direct Purchaser (Defendants Mosaic Company n/k/a MOS Holdings Inc. and Mosaic Crop Nutrition, LLC) (see Director Purchaser above)	6-12-2013	<p>For more information call:</p> <p>Claims Administrator 1-866 482-4786</p> <p>Or outside of the U.S. 1-781 575-4382</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
2-11-2013	08-CV-6910	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation (II) Indirect Purchaser MDL No. 1996 (Defendants Saskatchewan Inc. and PSC Sales (USA), Inc.) (collectively, "PCS")</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants exchanged sensitive, non-public information about prices, capacity, sales volumes, and demand; allocated market shares, customers and volumes to be sold; and coordinated on output, including the limitation of production, to further and enact the price fixing conspiracy. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants knowingly and fraudulently concealed their anticompetitive conduct from Plaintiff and the Class to further the conspiracy.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchase Potash Indirectly for end use and not for resale from the Defendants in the United States during the period 7-1-2003 through 1-30-2013.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.PotashIndirectSettlement.com</p>
2-11-2013	08-CV-6910	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation (II), Indirect Purchaser (Defendants Mosaic Company n/k/a MOS Holdings Inc. and Mosaic Crop Nutrition, LLC)</p> <p>(see Indirect Purchaser above)</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.PotashIndirectSettlement.com</p>
2-12-2013	10-CV-349	(M.D. La.)	<p>Toni Spillman, et al. v. Domino's Pizza LLC and RPM Pica, LLC</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants (specifically RPM Pizza, LLC, an independent</p>	5-4-2013	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1-877 552-1288</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>franchisee of Domino's Pizza stores) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") by sending unsolicited pre-recorded phone message advertisements ("robo-calls") about Domino's pizza and other food products to consumers in Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi. The lawsuit claims the calls were sent without the recipients' prior express consent.</p> <p>The Class includes anyone who received a robo-call on their cell phone by or on behalf of RPM advertising Domino's pizza or other food products offered for sale at RPM's stores to consumers in Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 20, 2009 and May 20, 2010 ("Monetary Sub-Class"), or • May 20, 2006 and May 19, 2009 ("Merchandise Voucher Sub-Class"). 		www.PizzaSettlement.com
2-13-2013	11-CV-05195	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Copi and Purcell, et al. v. Brainfuse, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant online and pre-assigned access tutors were not paid all compensation to which they were entitled due to the failure to make payment of overtime and minimum wage compensation for work performed completing student progress reports, tutoring past "cut-off" times, pre-tutoring session waiting time, preparation time, training and test-taking, performing work outside of tutoring session or scheduled shift time, email messaging, and participating in conference calls</p>	5-22-2013	<p>For more information write to or call:</p> <p>Jeffrey D. Dahl Dahl Administration, Inc. 6465 Wayzata Boulevard Suite 420 Minneapolis MN 55426</p> <p>952 562-3600</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>and online seminars.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who worked as an instant or pre-assigned access tutor for Brainfuse at any time from 8-1-2008 through 12-31-2011.</p>		
2-14-2013	12-CV-00426	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Stephenson v. Neutrogena</p> <p>Settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit about the packaging and advertising of Neutrogena® Naturals products. The plaintiffs in the lawsuit claim that the packaging and advertising for Neutrogena® Naturals products falsely claimed they were natural.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers of at least one of the following Neutrogena® naturals products at any time between 1-1-2011 and [insert first date notice will be published]: Neutrogena® Naturals Purifying Facial Cleanser, Purifying Pore Scrub, Face and Body Bar, Fresh Cleansing + Makeup Remover, Multi-Vitamin Nourishing Moisturizer, or Multi-Vitamin Nourishing Night Cream.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.facialcleanser settlement.com</p>
2-15-2013	10-CV-2657	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Malta v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Wells Fargo Bank, through its divisions Wells Fargo Home Mortgage and Wells Fargo Auto Finance (collectively "Wells Fargo") violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by calling cell phones without prior express consent using an automated telephone dialer during the Class Periods for</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.WellsFargoTCPAsettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>the two Subclasses: Subclass One Home Mortgage calls: 6-16-2006 to 11-16-2011 or Subclass Two Auto Finance calls: 12-23-2006 to 11-16-2011.</p> <p>Class Members are: 1) U.S. residents and 2) received one or more calls to a cellular telephone from (a) Wells Fargo Home Mortgage between 6-16-2006 to 11-16-2011 and/or (b) from Wells Fargo Auto Finance between 12-23-2006 to 11-16-2011 (collectively "Wells Fargo").</p>		
2-15-2013	09-CV-07420	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Montanez, et al. v. Gerber Childrenswear LLC. Plaintiffs allege that Gerber Childrenswear, LLC sold certain children's clothing with tagless labels which allegedly contained excessive amounts of chemicals that could possibly cause skin irritation.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased at retail new Gerber children's clothing in the United States containing tagless labels on garments manufactured by (1) Jay Jay Mills (India) with "M/S Gokul" labels from 10-1-2005 to 8-2008; (2) Jay Jay Mills (India) with redesigned "phthalate free" Gokul labels from 8-2008 through 9-30-2009; and (3) Kitex from 10-1-2005 through 5-20-2009.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to or call:</p> <p>William S. Brown Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP 104 South Main Street Ninth Floor Greenville, SC 29601 864 250-2300</p>
2-15-2013	11-CV-04586	(D.N.J.)	<p>Sabol v. Hydroxatone, LLC, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to adequately disclose terms of Risk Free Trials and Auto-Shipment Programs, refused to refund customers who timely returned Hydroxatone</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC Andrew N. Friedman</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>products, failed to allow consumers to timely cancel Hydroxatone Preferred-Customer Beauty Auto-Shipment Program memberships, and failed to cease billing consumers for Hydroxatone products after cancelling memberships. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants breached contract terms, violated the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act and unjustly enriched the Defendants.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons residing in the United States who between 1-1-2005 [insert date of Preliminary Approval Order] received, ordered, signed up for, paid for, and/or were charged for Hydroxatone-branded products, and/or were charged shipping and processing fees for such products, in connection with a Risk-Free Trial and/or Auto-Shipment Program, including but not limited to: Hydroxaton, Celtrixa, Hydrolyze, Declatone, Lashatone, Instant Effect, Luminique, Instant Wrinkle Filler, and Orexis.</p>		<p>Whitney R. Case Stefanie M. Ramirez 1100 New York Ave, NW Suite 500 West Washington, DC 20005</p>
2-18-2013	11-CV-00401 11-CV-00415 11-CV-00417 12-CV-00045	(N.D. Ind.)	<p>Jamila Swift v. DirectBuy, Inc. Janice Harris v. DirectBuy, Inc. Brian Vance v. DirectBuy, Inc. Phil Ganezer v. DirectBuy, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that DirectBuy's marketing materials, financing, and membership sales practices failed to disclose material information as to the full price paid to DirectBuy, and that DirectBuy receives payments from vendors, manufacturers, and suppliers. It is also alleged that DirectBuy failed to pass along price reductions to consumers, so that DirectBuy's shelf prices to consumers are not</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.membershipclubselement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>really reduced or the lowest prices as advertised.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased a DirectBuy membership and who are: 1) current DirectBuy members; or 2) were a DirectBuy member at any time between 10-11-2002 and Preliminary Approval Date.</p>		
2-19-2013	12-CV-303	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Nicole Newman v. AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that AmeriCredit violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), by calling persons using cell phone numbers with either an automated dialing system or by an artificial or prerecorded voice message, or both, without that person's prior express consent.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United States who were contacted on their cellular phones by AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc. through the use of an automated dialer system and/or an artificial or pre-recorded voice between 12-30-2007 through the date the Court preliminarily approves the settlement agreement, without prior express consent.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to or call:</p> <p>Joshua B. Swigart Hyde & Swigart 411 Camino Del Rio South Suite 301 San Diego, CA 92108</p> <p>619 233-7770</p>
2-14-2013	09-CV-02255	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Harel Insurance Ltd. v. Perrigo Company</p> <p>Lead Plaintiffs allege that, during the Settlement Class Period, Perrigo's stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of untrue or materially misleading</p>	5-17-2013	<p>For more information write to, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Jeremy a. Lieberman Pomerantz Grossman</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>statements the Settling Defendant (and former defendants) made concerning the sale and underwriting of \$18 million par value of Auction Rate Securities ("ARS") held by Perrigo. Plaintiffs allege that Perrigo failed to inform investors that the ARS held by Perrigo was sold and underwritten by Lehman Brothers ("Lehman"), whose bankruptcy had a material impact on the liquidity and creditworthiness of the securities. Plaintiffs further contend that the Settling Defendant and former defendants made these statements knowing them to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures and investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities that purchased Perrigo common stock on the NASDAQ market or by other means involving transactions in the United States between 11-6-2008 and 2-2-2009, inclusive.</p>		<p>Hufford Dahlstrom & Gross LLP 600 Third Avenue New York, NY 10016</p> <p>212 661-1100</p> <p>jalieberman@pomlaw.com</p>
2-20-2013	10-CV-00095	(D.S.C.)	<p>Robertson, et al. v. Sea Pines Real Estate Companies, Inc., et al.</p> <p>The lawsuit claims that the Defendants conspired to restrain the ability of certain brokerages to compete in the area served by Hilton Head Multiple Listing Services (MLS), which includes the counties of Beaufort, Jasper, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Colleton, Hampton and Orangeburg. The lawsuit claims that by limiting the ability of certain brokerages to compete effectively for real estate listings, Defendants</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Brian D. Penny, Esq. Goldman Scarlato Karon & Penny, P.C. 101 E. Lancaster Ave. Suite 204 Wayne, PA 19087</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>were able to maintain commission rates in the entire Hilton Head MLS service area at artificially high levels.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals or businesses that purchased defendants' real-estate brokerage services in connection with the sale of a home or lot in the MLS Service Area from 1-14-2006 through 9-17-2007. The brokerage defendants are Sea Pines Real Estate Companies, Inc., a/k/a the Sea Pines Real Estate Co.; Coastal Homes and Land, Inc. a/k/a Costal Homes & Land Realty; Collins Group Realty, Inc.; Engard Rental Company, LLC a/k/a Engard Real Estate Co.; Bruce A. Goff, Inc; Daufuskie Island Resort Realty, LLC; Searchlight Realty, Inc. a/k/a Searchlight Realty; Gateway Realty, LLC; Hilton Head Luxury Properties, Inc. a/k/a Prudential Premier Island Properties; Charter 1 Realty & Marketing; The William F. Hilton Company a/k/a William F. Hilton Realty; E.G. Robinson, II and Associates Realtors, Inc. a/k/a E.G. Robinson Real Estate; Gina Scott Realty; Julie Toon Pawley Real Estate Broker, Inc.; and CRG Properties, Inc. a/k/a Carolina Realty Group, Inc.</p>		
2-21-2013	10-CV-2093	(N.D. Ohio)	<p>Eliason v. Gentek Building Products, Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the Steel Siding manufactured by Defendants is defective and that Gentek failed to honor its express Limited Lifetime Warranty issued at the point of sale and the implied warranty of merchantability.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Whitfield Bryson & Mason LLP Gary E. Mason 1625 Mass., Ave., NW Suite 605 Washington, DC 20036</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are all persons, organizations, municipalities, corporations or other entities that own property, whether commercial or residential, on which Gentek Steel Siding was applied during the period 1-1-1991 through [Preliminary Hearing Date] (the "Class Period"), that is covered by a Gentek Steel Siding warranty and which siding experienced Steel Peel.</p>		
2-21-2013	11-CV-1925	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Vishva Desai and Philip J. Charvat v. ADT Security Services, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that certain ADT Authorized Dealers or lead generators, seeking to sell ADT's products and services, made numerous calls that violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who received a pre-recorded call(s) or call(s) to cell phone using automated dialing equipment which advertised ADT's goods or services.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>John W. Barrett Jonathan Marshall Bailey & Glasser, LLP 227 Capitol Street Charleston, W.Va. 25301</p>
2-22-2013	10-CV-00143	(D. Vt.)	<p>Semon, et al. v. Swenson, et al. Plaintiffs alleged that the transaction on 1-19-2011 (the "Transaction" or the "Merger"), pursuant to which Rock of Ages Corporation ("ROAC" or "the Company") was acquired by Swenson Granite Company LLC ("Swenson Granite") and its wholly owned subsidiary Granite Acquisition LLC for \$5.25 per share in cash (the "Merger Consideration") was part of an alleged scheme to acquire the Company for inadequate</p>	3-11-2013	<p>For more information write to, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Chet B. Waldman Wolf Popper LLP 845 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022</p> <p>212 759-4600 cwaldman@wolfpopper.co</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>consideration and in breach of Defendants' fiduciary duties.</p> <p>Class Members are all who held shares of ROAC common stock, either of record or beneficially, at any time during the period beginning on and including 5-7-2010, through and including 1-19-2011.</p>		<u>m</u>
2-22-2013	07-CV-01886	(D.P.R.)	<p>Hildenbrand v. W Holding Company, Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements concerning the Company's asset quality. Plaintiffs also allege that the Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about an Inyx loan in that it was subject to a vigorous review process that resulted in the proper disclosure of loan delinquencies, for which adequate loss reserves and appropriate measures to obtain recoveries in the event of borrower defaults were made. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants represented that the Company had adequate internal controls governing its underwriting and lending activities, and that W Holding reported artificially inflated financial results due to its failure to write down loans to Inyx and establish adequate reserves for loan losses. Lead Plaintiff alleges that these allegedly false and misleading statements were made in violation of §10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased the publicly traded securities of W Holding between</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Robert R. Rothman 58 South Service Road Suite 200 Melville, NY 11747</p> <p>Or:</p> <p>Whatley Kallas, LLC Joe R. Whatley, Jr. 380 Madison Avenue 23rd Floor New York, NY 10017</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			4-24-2006 and 6-26-2007, inclusive.		
2-22-2013	10-CV-2159	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>John F. Hutchins v. NBTY, Inc., Scott Rudolph, and Harvey Kamil Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are participants in a fraudulent scheme and course of conduct that operated as a fraud or deceit on purchasers of NBTY's common stock by disseminating materially false and misleading statements and/or concealing material adverse facts about the intrinsic value of NBTY's securities.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons that purchased the common stock of NBTY, Inc. ("NBTY" or the "Company") between 11-9-2009 and 4-26-2010, inclusive, and who were damaged thereby.</p>	6-5-2013	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Antonio Yanez, Jr. Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP 787 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10019</p>
2-25-2013	09-CV-8025	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Grund v. Principal Financial Group, Inc. and Delaware Charter Guarantee & Trust Co. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants did not properly perform fiduciary duties owed to investors when Westgate profit-sharing/pension funds were lost due to wrongdoing by Westgate principals.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who held a self-directed IRA, profit-sharing or pension account administered by Principal Trust on 2-29-2009, the funds of which account were invested in funds of Westgate and/or the Westgate Affiliates as of that date.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Jaboc H. Zamansky Zamansky & Associates LLC 50 Broadway 32nd Floor New York, NY 10004</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February 2013 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
2-28-2013	09-CV-1048 10-CV-2145	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Masonek v. Wells Fargo Bank In re: Medical Capital Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Wells Fargo and Bank of New York Mellon ("BNYM"), as hired trustees for Medical Capital, improperly disbursed millions of dollars in breach of contractual duties to investors.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased or acquired notes issued by Medical Provider Financial Corporation II, III, or IV, and/or Medical Provider Funding Corporation V or VI, and did not receive some or all of principal or interest payments.</p>	6-24-2013	<p>For more information visit or call: www.medicalcapitalclass.com 1-877 287-0718</p>